UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,831	02/05/2007	Ying C.Q. Zang	050989.0203.01USPC	2074
	7590 06/03/200 SHUGHART PC	EXAMINER		
700 W. 47TH S		EWOLDT, GERALD R		
SUITE 1000 KANSAS CITY	7, MO 64112-1802		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1644	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/03/2009	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/575,831	ZANG, YING C.Q.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	G. R. Ewoldt, Ph.D.	1644
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPUBLICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IF Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26.      This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ Th      Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4)  Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-14 is/are withdray 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ Application Papers  9)  The specification is objected to by the Examir 10)  The drawing(s) filed on 4/14/06 is/are: a) applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	wn from consideration.  /or election requirement.  ner. accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure.</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list.</li> </ul>	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat iority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/22/08.	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5)  Notice of Informal F 6)  Other: <u>Sequence N</u>	ate Patent Application

Application/Control Number: 10/575,831 Page 2

Art Unit: 1644

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the paper filed 3/26/09 is acknowledged.

Applicant argues that the subject matter of the claims is naught taught nor suggested by the cited references.

As set forth below in Sections 7 and 9, the claimed method is neither novel nor does it comprise an inventive step. Accordingly, a lack of unity of invention has been established and restriction is proper.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 8-14 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected inventions.

Claims 1-7 are under examination.

- 3. The Title and Abstract are objected to because they do not adequately describe the claimed invention. Applicant is advised that a Title commensurate in scope with the invention of the instant claims, e.g., "A method of making an autologous CD8<sup>+</sup> T cell vaccine for treating multiple sclerosis", is required. An Abstract disclosing said method is also required. See MPEP 608.01(b).
- 4. The drawings are objected to for the following reasons:
  - A) The text labeling the axes in Figure 3 is illegible.
  - B) The symbols in the graphs of Figure 6A are illegible.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional

Art Unit: 1644

replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action.

The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

- 5. This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825. Specifically, the Sequence Listing fails to disclose all of the priority documents at line <150>.
- 6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-3, 5, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Jurewicz et al. (1998) as evidenced by U.S. Patent No. 6,806,258.

Jurewicz et al. teaches the claimed method of making a  ${\rm CD8}^+$  T cell composition comprising:

- A) providing PBMCs,
- B) reducing the number of  $\mathrm{CD4}^+$  T cells (by enriching for  $\mathrm{CD8}^+$  T cells),
- C) adding the MS-associated antigen comprising the MBP peptide of SEQ ID NO:3, APCs, and IL-2, and
- D) repeating the process. (see particularly CD8 T cell lines, bridging pages 3056 and 3057).

Note that the  $^{\prime}258$  patent is cited merely to show that IL-2 can be considered to be a T cell mitogen (see particularly column 1, last paragraph),

The reference teaching anticipates the claimed invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/575,831

Art Unit: 1644

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 4

9. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 03/024393 (IDS) in view of Huseby et al. (2001, IDS).

WO 03/024393 teaches the claimed method of making a T cell vaccine including the use of MS-associated antigens including MBP and MBP fragments 83-99 and 151-170 and the inclusion of a mitogen including conA (see particularly page 2,  $3^{\rm rd}$  full paragraph - page 3,  $1^{\rm st}$  paragraph).

The reference teaching differs from the claimed invention only in that it does not teach reducing the population of  ${\rm CD4}^+$  T cells in the vaccine.

Huseby et al. teaches that MBP-specific CD8<sup>+</sup> T cells induce severe CNS autoimmunity in wild-type mice (see particularly, page 670, MBP-specific CD8<sup>+</sup> T Cells Induce CNS Autoimmunity). The reference further teaches the CD8<sup>+</sup> T cells are direct effectors of disease because they induce disease in scid mice (see particularly, Figure 2). The reference further teaches that CD25<sup>+</sup>CD4<sup>+</sup> T cells "perform a regulatory function in inhibiting autoimmunity" (see particularly, page 673, column 1). Finally, the reference teaches that the disease of the MBP-CTL-mediated model resembles the Pattern IV disease of Lucchinetti et al. (2000) seen in some PPMS patients (see particularly page 674, column 1).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to produce the T cell vaccine of WO 03/024393 enriched for  $CD8^+$  T cells, i.e., with a reduced population of  $CD4^+$  T cells, given the teachings of Huseby et al. First, Huseby et al. teaches that  $CD8^+$  T cells can be direct effectors of CNS autoimmunity (and would thus, comprise an obvious vaccine target). Additionally,

Application/Control Number: 10/575,831

Art Unit: 1644

the reference teaches that the MBP-CTL-mediated model disease resembles the disease seen in some PPMS patients. Accordingly, the ordinarily skilled artisan would be motivated to produce a T cell vaccine enriched in CD8<sup>+</sup> T cells if only specifically for the treatment of Pattern IV PPMS. Additionally, the ordinarily skilled artisan would be motivated to reduce the number of CD4<sup>+</sup> T cells in the vaccine because of the regulatory function of CD25<sup>+</sup>CD4<sup>+</sup> T cells. Given said regulatory function the ordinarily skilled artisan would not want to produce a vaccine targeting those regulatory T cells.

Page 5

- 10. No claim is allowed.
- 11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Gerald Ewoldt whose telephone number is (571)272-0843. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30 am to 5:30 pm. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla, Ph.D. can be reached on (571) 272-0878.
- 12. **Please Note:** Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197.

/G.R. Ewoldt/
G.R. Ewoldt, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 1600